



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/444,359	11/18/1999	DONALD E. GILLESPIE	USW#1674	8540
22193	7590	07/19/2007	EXAMINER	
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800 DENVER, CO 80202			NGUYEN, TU X	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2618		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/444,359	GILLESPIE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tu X Nguyen	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,8-17,20 and 24-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-7,18,19 and 21-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,8-17,20 and 24-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 and 17 have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant argument "Further, the motivation cited by the Office Action is irrelevant to the Applicants' claimed invention. The motivation relates to providing information-based information services. The claimed invention relates to call processing. Hence, the motivation has nothing to do with the Applicants' claimed invention, and the pending claims are allowable for this additional reason". The Examiner respectfully disagrees; the Applicant claim limitations are not strictly for "voice data" only, the Applicant claim limitations may include using information service to support the voice communications, or broadly interpret as using telephone calls for connection but using information services for other purposes such as "user-define location dependent rules", wherein "the user-define location rules" may be broadly interpret not only a voice call but include data services. Hence, Ben-Yehezkel et al. teaching a method of using cellular phone to deliver information and the user interest in traffic report at a defined current location diameter, is appropriate for a combination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

Art Unit: 2618

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 8-17, 20, 24-42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Alperovich et al. (US Patent 6,233,448) in view of Ben-Yehezkel et al. (US Patent 6,049,711).

Regarding claim 1, Alperovich et al. disclose a method for processing telephone calls for a mobile subscriber associated with a wireless network the method comprising:

at the wireless network, receiving from the mobile subscriber user-defined, location-dependent rules associated with at least one telephone service subscribed to by the mobile subscriber (see col.4 lines 20-25), wherein each rule received from the mobile subscriber at the wireless network includes a specification for at least one geographic area associated with the mobile subscriber and rules for processing the at least one telephone service for the mobile subscriber when the mobile subscriber is in one of the geographic areas (see col.3 lines 65 through col.4 line 15),

determining a current location of the mobile subscriber (see col.2 lines 15-17); and
processing the telephone services based on the location-dependent rules and the current location of the mobile subscriber (see col.2 lines 22-29).

Alperovich et al. fails to disclose the specification defines a geographic region having a predetermined radius from a current location of the subscriber that changes dynamically as the current location change.

In the related art, Ben-Yehezkel et al. discloses the specification defines a geographic region having a predetermined radius from a current location of the subscriber that changes dynamically as the current location change (see col.4 lines 10-33). Therefore, It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Alperovich et al. with the above teaching of Ben-Yehezkel et al. in order to provide location dependent, thus the system provides user-defined information related to user interest such as traffic report at the current location.

Regarding claim 17, Alperovich et al. disclose database (see col.4 lines 21-25) for storing user-defined, location-dependent rules associated with at least one telephone service subscribed to by the mobile subscriber; and service logic for determining a current location of the mobile subscriber and generating call processing instructions for processing the telephone calls based on the user-defined, location-dependent rules and the current location of the mobile subscriber (see col.2 lines 10-40),

Alperovich et al. fails to disclose the specification defines a geographic region having a predetermined radius from a current location of the subscriber that changes dynamically as the current location change.

In the related art, Ben-Yehezkel et al. discloses the specification defines a geographic region having a predetermined radius from a current location of the subscriber that changes dynamically as the current location change (see col.4 lines 10-33). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Alperovich et al. with the above teaching of Ben-Yehezkel et al. in order to provide location dependent, thus the system provides user-defined information related to user interest such as traffic report at the current location.

Regarding claim 9, The modified Alperovich et al. disclose receiving signal includes continuously receiving the signal from the wireless subscriber (see The modified Alperovich, col.2 lines 14-15, “periodically” reads on “continuously”).

Regarding claims 8, 14-15 and 24-25 and 27, The modified Alperovich et al. disclose receiving a signal from the mobile subscriber (Alperovich, see 34, fig.1); determining the location of the mobile subscriber based on the signal from the mobile subscriber and the known location of the at least one base station (see Alperovich, element 32, fig.1, col.3 lines 28-50).

Regarding claim 10, 26, The modified Alperovich et al. disclose receiving signal includes the signal from the wireless subscriber in response to a prompt from the wireless network (see Alperovich, col.3 lines 28-64).

Regarding claim 11, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose receiving the signal includes receiving a Global Positioning Signal from the mobile subscriber (see Alperovich, col.3 lines 29-30).

Regarding claims 12-13, 28-29 and 30-31, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose the service logic, in receiving the signal (see Alperovich, col.5 lines 61-65), outgoing call form the mobile subscriber (see Alperovich, col.5 lines 46-47), is further operative to receive a strength of the signal from the mobile subscriber (see Alperovich, col.3 lines 34-50, “triangulation” reads on “signal strength, triangulation is a method to determined user location base on signal strength).

Regarding claims 16 and 32, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose determining supplemental subscriber information from the mobile subscriber (see Alperovich, col.4 lines 51-52); and wherein processing a telephone call further comprises processing the telephone call based on the supplemental subscriber information.

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 20, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose the interface is further operative to receive a signal as part of the specification that defines a changing geographic area dependent on the current location of the subscriber (see Ben, col.4 lines 10-33).

Regarding claims 33, 37-38 and 42, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose the current location of the mobile subscriber includes an area not defined by the boundaries of a cell of the wireless network (see Alperovich, col.5 lines 59-61).

Regarding to claims 35-36, 40-41, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose at least one telephone service includes call forwarding and do not disturb (see Alperovich, col.5 lines 25-26, col.5 lines 61-62).

Regarding claims 34 and 39, the modified Alperovich et al. disclose at least one telephone service includes caller identification (see Alperovich, col.8 lines 6-10).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2618

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7883.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached at (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



July 10, 2007



EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600